Questions & Answers from December 13th RWC

Q: Will we receive more guidance about who we should notify to attend the web training for REEport? Can you provide a description of the training that we can forward to them so they understand the importance? Should we tell all Project Investigators/Directors and/or other faculty to attend?

A: Yes. You will receive more guidance about what exactly each of the trainings will cover. This will help inform you of who exactly should attend. We will send out a packet of information via the REEport listserv and post the same information on the REEport web page. As of right now, only current Site Contacts who will become "Site Admins" in REEport as well as any additional person who would serve as an additional Site Admin (REEport allows more than one) should plan on attending the REEport training in January. The training in February should be attended by all Project Directors (PDs, also known as Project Investigators/PIs) who initiate projects and file progress/accomplishment reports as well as administrative staff responsible for financial reporting, and any other administrative staff who are involved with entering data about research projects into REEport. (Rule of thumb: If they are currently involved in using CRIS Webforms, they should attend the REEport trainings.)

Training Dates:

January 24 & 29, 2-4 pm Eastern

- Topics focused on Site Administration and basic project workflow/reporting so that Site Admins can determine which roles to assign to users and what workflow privileges to set based on how their station functions. Will also cover basic data entry in modules; if more specifics are desired on this portion, SAs should also attend the February training for all users.

February 13 & 26, 2-4 pm Eastern

- All Users Training: SAs, PDs/PIs, other Administrative staff who currently use Webforms. Topics will focus on how projects flow through REEport within the four modules (Project Initiation, Progress REEport, Final Report, and Project Changes.) Guidance on data entry and new fields not currently found in CRIS Webforms will be given.

Q: If we have some of the national outcomes and indicators listed as our state defined out comes, should we enter a report there as well as under the national outcomes & indicators tab using Google Forms? Or would this count as double reporting?

A: Any data you have collected and plan to report for the NOIs should be reported via the Google Forms IN ADDITION to if you have them listed as state defined outcomes. Please know that this will not count as "double reporting." We ask that you PLEASE enter the data using the Google forms, as that is the only method we have of aggregating all the data on a national level. We will not be taking the same data that you put in your AR and combining it with that we collect in the Google Forms. To be clear: if you ONLY report such data as part of your state defined outcomes, it will not be included in the national aggregate, which defeats the whole purpose of the NOIs.

Q: Can you clarify Animal Health Capacity reporting as it relates to the Ad-419 process? It seems as if there is a new process this year, but it's not clear what is different.

A: Nothing has changed this year with Animal Health Capacity reporting. This year, we simply want to make sure the point is clear that when your capacity reports are provided to you via Lisa Stephens and Dr. Gary Sherman, you must carefully review the list to make sure that all your pertinent grant projects are included WITH the appropriate expended funds and SYs. Currently, NIFA is not able to produce capacity reports for stations that list the non-formula grants with the correct funding amounts and SYs. Thus, even though you may see a certain non-formula grant listed (the title will be there with the correct animal health percentage), you must edit the report and send it back to Gary/Lisa with the correct expenditure amount and SYs on that grant for that fiscal year (the report will originally come to you with "zeros" listed across the board for any non-formula, NIFA based grant that is on your Capacity Report). This is not a new process from last year, but we've realized we needed to make the point clearer because not all of our partners were aware if this issue with the Capacity Report as it was provided to them.

Q: Can you expand upon the policy change that was sent out in Dr. Ramaswamy's memo, RE: no longer including National Priority Areas in our POWs?

A: Regarding the policy change this year redacting the requirement for all states to include the 5 priority areas as planned programs in their Plans of Work and Annual Reports: This policy change DOES NOT REQUIRE YOU TO MAKE ANY CHANGES to the names or structure of your planned programs as they are currently listed in your POW or AR. All we are saying is that you have the flexibility now to change them IF IT MAKES SENSE for your research and extension activities. Some states may choose to change all the names of their programs that currently reflect the 5 priorities, while others might choose to keep them all. Others may keep, for example, just one program named Climate Change but have 6 others programs that they've named themselves and do not include any of the other 4 priorities. They key here is that NIFA wants to give the states more FLEXIBILITY to name their programs as they see fit and to make sure those names accurately reflect the research and extension activities described in the program.